

Remarks

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1-15 are rejected.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ino (US Patent No. 5,861,825) in view of Kai et al. (US Patent No. 5,832,407).

As discussed previously, Ino is directed to a method to modulate and demodulate data from a medium upon which is recorded digital signals. See column 1, lines 7-11. The method discloses using a state machine to shorten the path between states and thereby make the detected results more definite while providing denser storage of data. See the Summary of the Invention. As such, the directions referred to in Ino are the directions on the paths of the state machine diagrams, which are plotted on an X and Y axis as shown in Ino, Figures 5, 6, 10 and 11. Movement is also referred to as being movement along the X or Y axis of the state machine diagrams.

Kai is directed to detection of stationary objects external to the moving object by a laser detection system. See Figures 1a-1c and Figures 5a-5c. The laser detector is detecting the presence and relative positional changes of stationary objects relative to a car. The object position is not the position of the moving object (the car), but of other objects, external to the car and stationary.

As amended, claims 1, 8 and 13 require that the samples be obtained from detectors on a moving object, and that the last object direction is the last object direction for the moving object. This is not shown, taught nor suggested by the combination of references above. It is therefore submitted that claims 1, 8 and 13 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the combination of references does not teach, show nor suggest the invention as claimed in claim 1, much less the further limitations of the dependent claim. It is therefore submitted that claims 2-7 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the combination of references does not teach, show nor suggest the invention as claimed in claim 1, much less the further limitations of the dependent claim. It is therefore submitted that claims 2-7 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 9-12 depend from claim 8 and inherently contain all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the combination of references does not teach, show nor suggest the invention as claimed in claim 8, much less the further limitations of the dependent claim. It is therefore submitted that claims 9-12 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 14-15 depend from claim 13 and inherently contain all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the combination of references does not teach, show nor suggest the invention as claimed in claim 13, much less the further limitations of the dependent claim. It is therefore submitted that claims 14-15 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Of Attorneys for Intel Corporation
Reg. No. 35,349

Customer No. 32231
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613